



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
166 Water Street  
Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026

October 3, 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR: EWTS  
Northeast Fisheries Observer Program Observers

FROM: David Potter  
Branch Chief, FSB

SUBJECT: 2007-2008 Evaluation Year

This memo is to inform observers of our current evaluation system for the 2007-2008 evaluation year. Each quarter an evaluation is conducted by the branch for each observer. These assessments are intended to give both the observer and contractor feedback on how they are performing in their job. Below is a description of the criteria used to evaluate each observer. The 4 quarters this evaluation year are:

Quarter 1 – April through June 2007  
Quarter 2 – July through September 2007  
Quarter 3 – October through December 2007  
Quarter 4 – January through March 2008

#### CATEGORY I. DATA QUALITY

After each trip, a Data Quality Sheet (included in packet) will be filled out by FSB. The total number of points an observer can earn on this sheet is 80 points. These 80 points are broken down as follows:

Element 1	10 points – OBSCON CRITERIA
Element 2	20 points – COMPLETENESS/FORMATting
Element 3	50 points – SAMPLING/PROTOCOLS

In the top right hand corner of this sheet there is a box that says *Points Earned* where the observer's points will be circled. Observers can receive either the full points for each element or none of the points (i.e., for Element 1, OBSCON CRITERIA, you may earn 10 points or 0 points, etc.). At the completion of the quarter, the points will be added up in the Data Quality Section, and divided by the number of trips. Once a month a copy of your Data Quality Sheets will be e-mailed to you (or mailed if you don't have e-mail).



## CATEGORY II. COMMUNICATIONS

Ten points of the evaluation will be based on communications. The 10 points for communications are based on 5 elements:

Element 1 - Communication with Editors

Element 2 - Communication with NMFS staff

Element 3 - Willingness to Improve Data

Element 4 - Overall Progress in Data Collection/Quality

Element 5 - Overall Attitude

Each element is worth up to 2 points. The observer will be assigned a 0, 1 or 2 for each element. The total number of points (potential of 10) will be summed for the quarter and added to the total score.

## CATEGORY III. FIELD PERFORMANCE

Ten points of the evaluation will be based on field performance. The 10 points for field performance are based on 2 elements:

Element 1 - Field Performance

Element 2 - Captain's interviews

Each element is worth up to 5 points. The total number of points (potential of 10) will be summed for the quarter and added to the total score.

## CATEGORY IV. EXTRA CREDIT

A maximum of 5 extra points can be awarded. Justifications for earning extra credit may include: Observer of the Month, bringing in fish for training, coming up with innovative sampling ideas, etc. Extra credit points will also be summed on a quarterly basis and added to the total score. An observer can achieve a total of 105 points per quarter.

Each observer will be placed in a group depending on their final score. Below is a description of the scores assigned to each group.

Group	Points
A	90.0 – 105.0
B	85.0 – 89.9
C	84.9 or below

At the end of each quarter, observers will receive an e-mail with any Data Quality Sheets they have not yet received. A hard copy of a letter will be mailed that will indicate how many points out of the 105 possible points were obtained (total score), your achieved group, and how many days were achieved for the quarter.

We hope that by instituting these changes we will provide you with more timely feedback on your data quality and field performance status. We hope that will enhance data quality by averaging trip scores across the quarter and encourage communication. We do not want



observers to be hesitant to describe unusual circumstances during a trip, in fear that their data quality score will be affected – so before you start thinking that, please let us know.

If you have any questions regarding how the evaluation system works, please contact KB McArdle at 508-495-2377 or by e-mail ([Katherine.McArdle@noaa.gov](mailto:Katherine.McArdle@noaa.gov)). As always thanks so much for your hard work and stay safe.



Vendor	AIS	EWTS
Funding	Program	Industry

**DATA QUALITY/OBSCON**

(Worth 80% of your total score)

Points Awarded		
OBSCON	0	10
Comp./Format.	0	20
Samp./Protocols	0	50

Trip Identification: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Landed: \_\_\_\_\_

# Days: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>OBSCON CRITERIA - 10%</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>EXPLANATION (Continue on back if needed)</b>
1. Were Obscon and Obstacle called in for this trip?			
2. Were the data received on time?			
<b>COMPLETENESS/FORMATting - 20%</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>EXPLANATION (Continue on back if needed)</b>
1. Are the species on the haul log, length frequency log, and age structure samples all in accordance? <b>Check "NO" if greater than 0.5 fields were wrong per sea day.</b> # days                      # incorrect fields                      Avg. per day			
2. Were all fields completed when required (and if not, was a comment included)? <b>Check "NO" if greater than 0.3 fields were omitted per page.</b> # pages                      # omitted fields                      Avg. per pg			
3. Were all fields completed correctly and in the proper format (and if not, was a comment included)? <b>Check "NO" if greater than 0.3 fields were wrong per sea day.</b> # pages                      # incorrect fields                      Avg. per pg			
<b>SAMPLING/PROTOCOLS- 50%</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>EXPLANATION (Continue on back if needed)</b>
1. Were the six-month questions asked, if required?			
2. Were all logs included and were all the appropriate logs used (including all required reporting logs)?			
3. Were all hauls observed correctly, as required?			
4. Were the appropriate samples collected for fish crustaceans, and shellfish (including weights, lengths, sex, samples, etc.)?			
5. Were the appropriate samples collected for incidental takes (minium sampling requirements and biological samples)?			
6. Were there other unacceptable or outstanding errors?			